

DE GAULLE: *Supports battle for Berlin* (437)

REDS: *Their emerging tactics in the US* (437)

LATTIMORE: *The Outer Mongolia question* (437)

RUSK: *Wavering on Red China?* (438)

FULBRIGHT: *Study in appeasement* (439)

Big Charlie's Strategy: General Charles de Gaulle believes that the climax of the present international crisis, arising from Khrushchev's demands concerning Berlin, will come in the fall, probably in October—according to a dispatch to HUMAN EVENTS from a well-informed special correspondent in Paris.

The General plans to bring four more divisions (in addition to the one already announced) to France from Algeria by fall, not to mention three fighter plane squadrons.

De Gaulle's thinking—according to our correspondent—runs as follows: French forces can no longer decide the future of Algeria, but they can decide the future of Europe. Should the West yield again and Khrushchev succeed in winning the diplomatic battle for Berlin, it would not matter how many French divisions are in Algeria. Then Europe, the Mediterranean area and the Near and Far East would move into the Red camp.

But if, on the other hand, the West stands firm with the aid of the French, German and American forces and checks Khrushchev, de Gaulle will get what he wants in Algeria. The Algerian rebels will accept his terms. Algeria's fate will not be decided on its own soil, but on the Rhine and the Elbe.

Our correspondent reports that de Gaulle, in this course, has the full support and confidence of the French people. True, the farmers' rebellion is causing quite a commotion domestically, but the French do not blame Big Charlie in this agricultural matter. They make Debre (de Gaulle's Prime Minister) the goat. The French public understands that the General has to limit his attention to directing the international and military affairs of the country.

American Communist Line: The Communist Party of the U.S.A. is readying a crescendo of propaganda against the Supreme Court decisions ordering the party to register and confirming the Smith Act (of 1940) which makes it a crime for anyone to belong to a group advocating violent overthrow of the government.

The kickoff of this Communist game appeared in the form of an advertisement (signed by the National Committee of the party) in the New York

Times on June 26, appealing to "all Americans" to act together to save "constitutional liberties" by "speaking up" against the Court decisions. This is the temporary pitch, designed by the party leaders, to rouse public opinion, until later Supreme Court action clarifies precisely what the Reds confront legally. After the famous Court decision, Justice Felix Frankfurter granted a stay of execution. The Court will not act on the stay until October at the earliest.

Meanwhile, it is known in Washington that secret instructions have gone out from the Secretary of the party to the cells.

These order the members to implement the appeal issued in the above-mentioned New York *Times* advertisement, stressing the "violation of the constitutional rights of American citizens." The cells are directed to broadcast the ideas in the advertisement by other newspaper ads, speeches, contacts with members of Congress and spreading printed literature.

Finally, when the Court rules on the stay of execution, the party will make a choice of a number of alternatives, such as going underground, changing the party name, etc.

Lattimore Rides Again: While the State Department is now admittedly pressing for US recognition of Outer Mongolia, it is deemed more than a passing coincidence that at this very moment a Professor of Far Eastern History from Johns Hopkins University is traveling throughout that Soviet-controlled satellite. His name is Owen Lattimore.

This is the same Owen Lattimore who, as a State Department adviser to Presidents Franklin D. Roosevelt and Harry Truman, supported the Chinese Communists against our Nationalist Chinese allies, who thought the United States should oust Syngman Rhee from leadership in Korea, who recommended applying a Morgenthau plan to Japan, and who was described in 1952 by a unanimous, bipartisan Senate subcommittee as a "conscious articulate instrument of the Soviet conspiracy."

Lattimore, who has been billed as an "expert" on Outer Mongolia in liberal circles, left this country in May, the same month the State Department let it be known that it was seriously considering recognizing Outer Mongolia and only a few weeks before the Assistant Secretary of State for Far Eastern Affairs, Walter P. McCaughy, explained the State Department's intention to the House Committee on Foreign Affairs.

While a State Department spokesman told HUMAN EVENTS that the State Department did not officially

send Lattimore to Outer Mongolia, he said the Department would welcome his views when he returned to the United States in October.

Although Outer Mongolia has been a Soviet satellite since 1924 and sent 5,000 troops to fight against the United Nations forces in the Korean War, the State Department contends that it wants to set up diplomatic relations in order to obtain a "listening post."

Swedish explorer George K. Soderbon, who lived in Mongolia for 16 years and is a recognized expert on that region, exploded the Department's reasoning by claiming the only thing we will be able to hear are the "winds of the Gobi Desert." The central aim of those Administration forces supporting Outer Mongolia's recognition, it is believed, is not to obtain a listening post, but to soften up this country's resistance to recognizing Red China.

Business vs. JFK: American business, as represented by the Business Advisory Council (BAC) of the Department of Commerce, has broken with the Kennedy Administration, and will now go on its own way without official chaperonage.

This leaves business with no top-level representation in official circles. Labor is represented in the Cabinet by Labor Secretary Arthur Goldberg, former lawyer for the United Steelworkers union and the AFL-CIO.

A BAC committee headed by Roger Blough, board chairman of the U.S. Steel Corporation, and including five other big business spokesmen, presented on July 6 to President Kennedy a plan for Council operation on a "broader base." It offered to advise any US agency and not alone the Commerce Department.

Thus the Council divorced itself from the Commerce Department and fired as titular chairman the Secretary of Commerce, Luther H. Hodges, who recently had restricted the Council's operations to bring them in line with Administration policies.

The committee action is subject to ratification at a New York meeting of the 75 members. That is regarded as sure.

The BAC was established in 1933 by the then Secretary of Commerce, Daniel Roper, under the FDR Administration.

Strikes: Comparisons are being drawn here between the alacrity with which the Kennedy Administration moved to enforce laws protecting "freedom riders" in the South and its "reluctant and distasteful" attitude toward invoking a Taft-Hartley Act injunction against the maritime strikers. It seems to be a question of which law you want to enforce.

President Kennedy and Labor Secretary Arthur Goldberg, conscious of the need to preserve their labor-boss support, promise efforts to get Congress to change Taft-Hartley so that national-emergency action in dangerous strikes will be made "more equitable" to labor unions. They may ask Congress to legalize Federal seizure of industries in labor

troubles or to establish compulsory arbitration for national emergencies. Either proposal would be strongly fought.

Any amendment attempt would open up all of the Taft-Hartley Act for further tightening or loosening changes—the rock on which previous attempts have foundered. Congressional observers see no chance of success for any such action in the current session.

As a matter of fact, both Democrats and Republicans still in Congress, from among those who helped enact T-H over a Truman veto 14 years ago, are pretty well satisfied with the way the emergency injunction has worked. It has been used 14 times and in every case a destructive strike was eventually settled without lasting harm to "free collective bargaining."

It isn't true, as is often alleged, that, after expiration of an 80-day injunction, a strike may be resumed with the government robbed of any further recourse to protect the public. Nothing in the law prohibits use of a second injunction after resumption of a strike. And the law provides specifically that if an injunction fails to get results, the President must report the facts to Congress, which can provide any further remedy it deems desirable.

Disarmament: The proposed US Disarmament Agency—which President Kennedy wants as an official branch of the State Department—received a sound cuffing last week from Illinois Republican Paul Findley, a freshman Congressman who shows promise of giving the appeasement element some bad moments.

Findley stated that the proposed agency, which is the pet project of Minnesota's Hubert Humphrey, offers "new evidence of uncertainty and confusion in our foreign policy. On one hand, we appropriate an unprecedented sum for armed forces and speak of the impending crisis—perhaps war—over Berlin. On the other, we talk of disarmament and refrain from testing our nuclear weapons.

"Disarmament is unthinkable today. If we concluded an agreement with Russia for disarmament or nuclear test control, what would it be worth? We should have learned long ago that agreements mean nothing to the Communists. Words are weapons, to be used in whatever manner suits Communist purposes. The Communists will sign an agreement for disarmament or nuclear test control only when they have a sure-fire way to beat that agreement. Creation of a disarmament agency would bring false hope to those who long for the day when mankind can safely beat our swords into plowshares and our spears into pruning hooks. That day is not yet here, and indeed cannot be seen even on the distant horizon."

Rusk on Red China: Worried anti-Communists believe that they perceive what Secretary of State Rusk's thinking is all about in terms of Red China. Recently a United Press International story quoted Rusk as saying the United States "has no definite

strategy for blocking Communist China's next bid for admission to the United Nations The US does not have a single answer or a single plan to prevent seating of the Communists."

Aside from this negativism in the face of the determined efforts from many quarters stumping for recognition of Red China, Rusk has also indicated that our UN delegates, Adlai Stevenson and Eleanor Roosevelt, have abandoned long-standing US opposition to seating of the Peiping regime. Rusk recently told a news conference that "US delegates in the UN have indicated other United Nations delegates think the question of Chinese Communist admission should be debated on its merits at the UN meeting in September."

It is remembered that an Associated Press report from London last April told of President Kennedy's alleged remark to British Prime Minister Macmillan that "he [President Kennedy] needs at least 12 months to prepare Americans to accept the Red Chinese into the world organization."

Concern grows that this softening up policy is moving at an accelerated rate. The Chicago *Sun-Times* reported during Japanese Prime Minister Ikeda's recent trip to the US that Kennedy and Rusk discussed with him the possibility of a "two-China" policy, which would call for the splitting of the present Chinese seat equally between the Communist and Nationalist Governments.

Congressman Frank Becker (R.-N.Y.), a member of the House Armed Services Committee, told HUMAN EVENTS last week: "American acquiescence to the admission of Red China into the UN would constitute the most disastrous strategic error of the Cold War. If we are not firm on this issue, we had better dig in on the beaches of San Francisco and Seattle. For to sell out to Red China would be to sell out our friends throughout the Far East."

Bureaucracy: The New Frontier has proved a boon to bureaucracy, John J. Williams (R.-Del.) charged on the Senate floor last week.

Williams, often teamed with Virginia's Democratic Senator Harry Flood Byrd in fighting big spending and waste in government, stated that the Kennedy Administration is responsible for \$2.3 billion of an estimated \$3 billion deficit in the fiscal budget for the year ended June 30, and that 33,445 Federal employees have been added to the government payrolls in the first four months of the new Administration. He noted that "the American people are just beginning to notice the enormous cost of the new spending programs of the Kennedy Administration."

"Upon assuming office, the President almost daily issued statements recommending a balanced budget, and boasting of the manner in which he was going to reduce government personnel. Instead of reducing the number of government employees, he has been building an ever expanding bureaucracy."

Williams said that during the first four months of the New Frontier, employees were put on the pay-

roll at the rate of over 8,000 a month, adding: "This is 2,000 per week, or 400 per day for every working day of a five-day week"

Arkansas Appeaser: The man whom President Kennedy nearly named as his Secretary of State, but had to reject because of political opposition within his own party, is still considered to be one of the most influential people guiding the President's foreign policy. That man is Senator J. William Fulbright (D.-Ark.), Chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

In the past few weeks, this Arkansas Senator has laid down a series of foreign policy "guidelines" which may very well explain why the Kennedy Administration has failed to act decisively in Laos, Cuba, *et al.* Fulbright, borrowing phrases directly from columnist Walter Lippmann (whom the President, himself, admits is his favorite columnist), maintained that it is "dangerous doctrine" for the United States to become involved in these "peripheral" struggles.

In one of his most incredible statements, he urged, supposedly for their own good, our strong anti-Communist Asian allies to become "neutral" and forget about seeking alignment with the West.

Fulbright also said it made little difference if the Soviet Union set up a missile base in Cuba and that for the United States to overthrow the Red dictatorship of Fidel Castro would be "self defeating." (It was Fulbright's impassioned plea against the Cuban invasion which was the single most important factor in influencing Kennedy to call off American air support, according to Stewart Alsop in the June 24 *Saturday Evening Post*.)

Fulbright's policy advice—which seems to have been adopted by the Administration in full or in part—does not represent the sentiments of most members of Congress. On the same day that Fulbright was cautioning against action in Cuba, Representative Armistead I. Selden, Jr. (D.-Ala.) lashed out against our weak-kneed policy toward Castro. As Chairman of the Inter-American Affairs Subcommittee of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, Selden reminded the Administration that the House on May 17 had called for action against Castro which the Administration has not yet taken. The Alabama Congressman said that Khrushchev will continue to pressure us around the world as long as he thinks we cannot protect ourselves from the Cuban dictator.

The American people, stated Selden, "applauded the President" when he implied—even after the invasion failed—that action would be forthcoming against Castro. "But they are still waiting, and

DAVID C. HEAD, Vice President, Public Relations and Development Department, The King's College, Briarcliff Manor, New York: "HUMAN EVENTS supplies me with quotable information and up-to-date ideas for continuing the relentless warfare in which we all are engaged. We desperately need multiplication of the ideas that you present, if we are to remain free."

waiting impatiently, for some indication that the President means what he says."

New Man on the Fed: George W. Mitchell, the President's new appointee to the seven-man Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, has been something of an enigma to Capitol Hill. The liberal Washington *Post* painted him as "an orthodox economist," even though it is recalled he was Director of Finance in Illinois while Governor Adlai E. Stevenson was busy draining an almost \$150 million surplus bequeathed by his Republican predecessor.

This week one of the nation's outstanding economists, who prefers to remain anonymous, told HUMAN EVENTS that Mitchell, rather than being "an orthodox economist," is of a "generally New Deal persuasion," and added:

"Mitchell has no academic standing in the field of money whatever. I know nothing he has written that is of any scholarly significance. In the Reserve Bank he has been pretty largely an organization man; in Chicago, largely an administrator He has the standard neo-Keynesian attitudes toward money—that the stock of money is of no importance in its own right, that what counts are conditions on the credit market, that the important aspects of Federal Reserve policy are what it does to interest rates, that fiscal policy must be the main reliance for anti-cyclical policy."

Helping the Unemployed: Styles Bridges, the ranking Republican in the Senate, has introduced a bill designed to prevent American industries from being ruined by unrestricted foreign competition, some of it from Communist countries.

Co-sponsored with 17 other Senators, including two Democrats, Robert Kerr (Okla.) and Strom Thurmond (S.C.), the bill would provide manufacturers and producers of raw materials (such as cotton) relief against competing imports, which they cannot get under present interpretation of the "escape" clause of the 1951 Trade Agreements Extension Act.

Bridges stated that this "escape clause"—which allows foreign import concessions to be withdrawn or modified—has been made "sterile by serious misinterpretations of congressional intent and failure to execute the built-in protection afforded by the framers of the Act."

The New Hampshire Senator put part of the blame on the Tariff Commission, which, Bridges charged, has refused to hear many complaints from US industries because of a restricted interpretation of the words "interested parties." Bridges also blamed President Kennedy for having refused to put into effect recommendations made by the Tariff Commission. Bridges' bill, therefore, would make any recommendations to relieve American industries by the US Tariff Commission "mandatory."

The Senator said his bill is not designed as a "weapon against world trade," but as a means to prevent unemployment among industries feeling the

impact of foreign competitors which do not have to maintain the high wage, health and safety standards that exist in America.

Capitol Camera: Capitol Hill sees the 1962 congressional elections shaping up as largely a personal contest between President Kennedy and Senator Barry Goldwater. Goldwater will campaign as chairman of the GOP Senate Campaign Committee and Kennedy, reportedly at the request of Democratic National Chairman John M. Bailey, will stump for Democratic candidates. This, it is thought, will dramatically pit Kennedy's liberal philosophy against Goldwater's conservatism. Such a dramatic contest, observers believe, could have strong 1964 significance.

• *After the grass-roots sampling in 19 states, expert public opinion pollster Samuel Lubell reports four of every five persons want the United States to stay in Berlin "even if it means war." While Lubell says the overwhelming majority of Americans think we should get tougher with Khrushchev, he states that few think an increase in foreign aid is necessary. Seventy-five per cent of the people interviewed were against any aid increase, says Lubell, while one-third wanted foreign aid cut sharply.*

• At the recent Governors' Conference in Hawaii, New Hampshire Republican Wesley Powell's resolution against Federal aid-for-teachers' salaries was defeated by one vote, 24-23, but only because the Governors of Samoa, Guam and the Virgin Islands—all Kennedy patronage appointees—voted against the Powell resolution!

• *The expiring Tractors for Freedom Committee, which President John F. Kennedy instigated while dodging official responsibility for it, says it will return to the senders—"unopened"—over 70,000 letters it has received. "Unopened!" Thus it will never be known how many of the letters contained contributions or how many were protests against official kow-towing to this form of Castro impudence and blackmail.*

• Educationists are stunned by the decision of Rockford College to develop its new \$15 million campus without the help of the Federal government. School President John Howard said, "We shall not seek direct matching funds, as provided in pending legislation, nor will we ask for the presently available building loans with their token, subsidized interest rates."

Published weekly at 410 First Street, S. E., Washington 3, D. C.
TRIAL SUBSCRIPTIONS: 5 weeks \$1. Yearly rate \$12.50; 6 months \$6.50; 3 months \$3.50. Second-class postage paid at Washington, D. C.

For change of address send old address EXACTLY AS IT APPEARS on the envelope of your copy of HUMAN EVENTS and new address (with zone number, if any). ALLOW US TWO WEEKS to process new subscriptions and change of address.

Bound volumes indexed, \$18. Only 1956, 1958, 1959 available.

Frank C. Hanighen, Editor and Publisher James L. Wick, Executive Publisher
Fred W. Perkins, Labor Editor W. B. Hicks, Jr., Assistant Publisher

Assistant Editors
John R. Benedict George O. Fowler Allan H. Ryskind
Svend Petersen Bruce R. Barr John R. Moreau
Neil Phelps-Munson Kenneth E. Thompson Sherrill A. Backer
Contributing Editors: Frank Chodorov Edna Lonigan

Production Manager: Robert M. Patterson

HUMAN EVENTS

... COMMENTARY ...

Vol. XVIII, No. 28 — Section II

July 14, 1961

Will Red China Question Split Democratic Party?

By Fulton Lewis, Jr.

A BATTLE ROYAL appears to be shaping up within the Democratic Party over the question of Communist China's entry into the United Nations.

Lining up on one side are the party's hard-nosed anti-Communists: Vice President Johnson, Senator Tom Dodd, House Majority Leader John McCormack. Aligned against them are the country's top-ranking diplomats: Adlai Stevenson, Chester Bowles, Dean Rusk.

The President, up to now, has remained neutral. But time is running out, for strategy must be developed if the country is to continue opposition to Red China's UN membership.

It is true, of course, that UN votes for Red China have been growing in recent years. But to those familiar with the situation, China can be kept out of the international body if the US so wishes.

Connecticut's Senator Dodd comments:

"We must keep the Red Chinese out. There are no two ways about it. If we have the will we have the way. We have done it in the past and can do it again."

Dodd, recently returned from a tour of the Orient and visits with free world leaders, says it is impossible to minimize the defeat this country would suffer if Red China were to enter the UN.

Admission of Red China would in all probability mean the expulsion of Nationalist China since the Communists have announced they will refuse to accept any "two-China" compromise.

To the leaders of free Asia, Dodd reports, UN admission would mean abandonment of Southeast Asia by the United States. It would signify approval of Communist China's aggression in Korea, murder in Tibet, intervention in Laos.

It would mean to free Asia that the United States had abandoned one of its loyal allies, that no nation could long depend upon Uncle Sam.

Vice President Johnson attempted to soothe a worried Asia on his recent jaunt, but its fears are by no means dispelled.

Working for US acquiescence is the State Department topside, which argues that recognition is "inevitable." Its line continues to the effect that the US can only alienate the world "neutrals" by voicing its opposition to Mao and Company.

Among those New Frontiersmen who have publicly advocated recognition are NATO Ambassa-

"If all the economic experts in the world were laid end to end, they would not reach a conclusion."

—George Bernard Shaw

KINDA GETS YOU RIGHT HERE—DOESN'T IT?



dor Thomas Finletter; Roving Ambassador W. Averell Harriman; Edwin O. Reischauer, Ambassador to Japan; John Kenneth Galbraith, Ambassador to India; Ambassador Without Portfolio Dean Acheson; Senate Foreign Relations Chairman J. W. Fulbright; and several of Kennedy's personal advisors, including W. W. Rostow, Paul Nitze and McGeorge Bundy.

Vocal, too, are the "team captains." Not only has Adlai Stevenson called recognition "inevitable," but the UN Ambassador sharply rapped efforts by the previous Administration to oppose Red China's membership.

Undersecretary of State Bowles now denies that he favors recognition. He told the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, however, that he would admit Red China on the promise it would not attack Formosa.

Secretary of State Rusk has been all over the political lot on the China issue. Twelve years ago, he compared the Communist Chinese to the American revolutionaries, then turned around a bit later to oppose their UN membership. His position today is uncertain.

It is remembered, however, that Rusk headed the Rockefeller Brothers Report team in December, 1959, which strongly condemned American non-recognition. Rusk's report claimed the US "must avoid wherever possible any course of action which seems to drive China closer to the Soviets" and warned that the US could not afford to see itself "cut off" from the mainland.

Political No Man's Land

From the Wall Street Journal

ALMOST EVERYONE, it seems, is dissatisfied in one way or another with the Kennedy Administration. Even its best friends are saying it is floundering like a fish on a beach. What is the trouble anyway?

A number of explanations readily occur for the confusion and curious out-of-control atmosphere in Washington—an atmosphere so palpable in regard to Cuba, Laos, the mishmash of domestic programs, the haphazard running of the White House, the inept handling of the press, and just about everything else of either major or minor significance.

One reason commonly heard is that the President is still working into his unenviable job; his supporters are hopeful about this on-the-job training, figuring he has the capacity to learn and is learning. Another explanation is that he has been the victim of uncommonly bad advice, which seems plain enough. A related view is that, whatever the first appearances, the quality of many of the advisers he brought to Washington is not very high. Still another is that Mr. Kennedy and his colleagues are temperamentally prone to speak more firmly than they are willing to act, which unquestionably does make for confusion.

There is, we suspect, a good deal of truth in all of this, and yet, take it all in all, it does not seem to be the whole of the trouble. For what it is worth, we sense an additional difficulty: In a deep and philosophical sense, this Administration does not know what it is doing or what it wants for America.

To be sure, Administration spokesmen talk a lot about national purpose, national goals and the need for citizens' sacrifices for the national interest. And the Administration does have broad goals, the same ones as would any other Administration—a just peace in the world, concern for the common weal at home. But all this is much too general to define a clear political philosophy.

In the present climate of American politics, two philosophies are possible. One is the traditional, Constitutional concept of Government: That the individual prospers best, materially and spiritually, when least hampered by Government, and that Government should do only what the people cannot do by themselves. However much this approach may be abused in political practice, it at least provides clear principles which can be applied in specific cases and specific choices.

The second philosophy is the doctrine of the Big Government solution: The answer to all problems and the foundation of all hopes lies in the expansion of the Federal Government. This, too, can be a self-consistent philosophy, leading logically to socialism if not totalitarianism.

The Kennedy Administration has so far shown little use for the first and leans strongly to the second. Yet the Administration is not prepared—nor would it be a politically realistic decision—to apply the doctrine of the Federal solution fully and consistently and logically. Thus, it finds itself in a foggy area somewhere in between the two, with no compass for direction and no dependable guide for the hard choices that have to be made.

This makes more difficult the conduct of foreign affairs, difficult enough at best. For example, while the Administration cannot yet be called soft on communism, it is very soft on socialism abroad, an attitude which is no help in fighting communism. In general, uncertainty as to one's own ideological stand complicates the countering of a determined and politically-committed foe.

In domestic matters, how can such an Administration draw any lines, set up any priorities among the myriad competing special-interest claims? Without a political philosophy, it has no logic with which to resist any. It tries to satisfy all but succeeds in satisfying none.

Even without a clear direction, there is a financial yardstick to determine how much is enough and how much is too much, but the Administration won't use it. Instead of insisting that the Government spend no more than it has left after meeting the requirements of defense, this Administration says categorically that budget deficits are "inevitable and appropriate" and that living within income is "totally unacceptable." This being said, there is no measure for setting priorities or, indeed, for saying "no" to anything.

It is no wonder the upshot of all this is to bewilder the nation and the world. We say that not merely in criticism of the President, for many circumstances and many associates are conspiring to make his job tougher than it need be, and he is entitled to sympathy on that account.

Still, it is up to him to pull his Administration out of its intellectual fog, and we hope he can. Until he does, the Administration will give the impression of floundering because it is in fact floundering in a political no-man's-land.

The Age of the Goof-Off

This country is experiencing the great era of the goof-off, the age of the half-done job. It is populated with laundrymen who won't iron shirts, with waiters who won't serve, with carpenters who will come around some day maybe, with executives whose minds are on the golf course, with teachers who demand a single salary schedule so that achievement cannot be rewarded, with students who take cinch courses. The land from coast to coast has been enjoying a stampede away from responsibility.

(Charles Brower, President of Batten, Barton, Durstine & Osborn:—UPI)

REPRINTS of this section available: single copy 20c; 10 for \$1; 25 for \$2; 100 for \$5; 500 for \$20; 1,000 for \$30. Order by section number and date of issue.

TRIAL SUBSCRIPTIONS: 5 weeks \$1. Yearly rate \$12.50; 6 months \$6.50. After you have read each section of HUMAN EVENTS, put it in an envelope and mail it to someone else who will value its contents.

Published weekly at 410 First Street, S. E., Washington 3, D. C.

Rumbles from the South

A recent editorial in the Fort Lauderdale (Fla.) *News* reported growing discontent in the South with Southern Democrats who have supported New Frontier legislation at the expense of the formerly effective Republican-Southern Democratic coalition in Congress:

"Patronage is the key weapon used by the Kennedy forces to break up the conservative coalition. Southern Democrats have been warned time and again that unless they swung behind the President's legislative program they might encounter serious trouble in getting the job appointments, the public works and other things they wanted out of the White House and the Congress. In addition to threatening the opposition forces with a cutoff of patronage, Southern Democrats who deserted the coalition have been rewarded with greater than usual slices of the patronage and influence pie.

"The effort by the Kennedy forces to win the Southern Democrats over to their side of the fence hasn't gone unnoticed. Throughout the Southland today a tide of discontent is beginning to rise against some of the Congressmen who have sold out their principles and jumped on the Kennedy bandwagon

"Some of these Congressmen have been so secure in their jobs that in the past they have never had to worry about facing serious political opposition at home. But next time many will face strong opposition and, if they keep on ignoring the wishes of their conservative constituents, some of them are very apt to wind up among the missing when the next session of Congress convenes"

Aid to Tito

By Congressman Richard H. Poff (R.-Va.)

Including foreign aid, credits, loans and other assistance, America has made available to Yugoslavia a total of more than \$2 billion. This has included \$14 million for locomotives, \$10 million for a plastics factory, \$127 million for other "industrial projects," and a *nuclear research reactor*.

And what has Marshal Tito given us in return?—the back of his hand! When America broke diplomatic recognition with Red Cuba, Red Tito sided with Red Castro and rebuked us. When Lumumba was slain in the Congo, the Yugoslav Communist Party, through newspaper advertisements and otherwise, organized hostile, violent public demonstrations against the West. Tito favors a UN seat for Red China; champions the false doctrine called "peaceful coexistence"; trades openly with Cuba; opposes inspection and control as a prerequisite to disarmament; allows Soviet engineers to operate the Iron Curtain's biggest uranium mines; and, according to reliable information, is even now permitting Russia to construct 10 missile bases on Yugoslav soil, aimed at the free world defense installations.

And the President's new foreign aid program calls for still more assistance to Yugoslavia.

This is Progress?

From the Indianapolis News

A few days ago it was announced that if a cure for heart disease is discovered the life expectancy of Americans will increase to about age 120. A day later Congress lowered the age of retirement on social security to 62. With progress at this rate it won't be long before there will be more people on social security than there are paying taxes to support them.

Taking Care of Our Elders

By Senator J. Glenn Beall (R.-Md.)

There are some newfangled ideas about the responsibility for taking care of our elders. People have been growing old for as long as the human race can remember. But only recently has there sprung up a widespread theory that "the aged" are a special class whose welfare should be the responsibility of the Federal bureaucracy. Just why has old age become so much more of a problem than it used to be? Is it a manifestation of an underlying disease—family culture and social fragmentation and breakdown? What used to be intimate family problems seem to have become matters for public decision.

Under a socialistic trend, grandfather and grandmother, instead of enjoying an honored position in the home, have become a problem for "social" solution. That children have some responsibility for the care of their elders is generally ignored. Indeed, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, which on occasion has been known to come out with some loonies, recently came out with a new brochure which suggests that parents now live so long that they can no longer expect to remain "a part of their younger relatives' family." The idea of a statute of limitations on family loyalty is something new.

The Peace Corps

By Congressman H. R. Gross (R.-Iowa)

When the so-called Peace Corps was first proposed, I raised the question of cost and how it was proposed that the boys and girls would communicate with the natives of Afghanistan, Tanganyika and Timbuktu while living the simple life with them in their thatched huts.

From the cost standpoint the answer was that the Peace Corps would be a stripped-to-the-bone, labor-of-love enterprise.

This member of Congress didn't believe that hokum then, and now comes the Kennedy brother-in-law, R. Sargent Shriver, director of this latest international boondoggle, demanding that Congress appropriate \$40,000,000 for just one year of operation.

Shriver and his purveyors of the simple life may not be able to speak any tribal dialects at this juncture, neither are they relying on smoke signals or sign language when they seek to shake down the taxpayers for \$40,000,000—just as a starter!



(AB1) BIG FLATS, N. Y., June 30, 1961—Farmer William T. Smith displays sign on Cadillac he bought with \$6,100 the government is paying him for keeping 104 acres out of corn production.

Farmer Gets \$6,100 Car for Not Farming

"Would you like a \$6,100 Cadillac, free, from Uncle Sam?" Representative Steven B. Derounian (R.) of New York asked and said that anyone can have one. "The only requirements are that you own a farm and don't farm."

Farmer William T. Smith of Chemung County, New York, bought a Cadillac with the money the Federal Government is paying him not to work 104 acres of the poorest land on his farm—land that wouldn't yield him 65 bushels of corn to an acre (a good acre of land would yield 100 bushels). Farmer Smith has a sign on the back of his Cadillac that says: "Thank you JFK. Thank you Orville. Thank you if you voted for them . . . We bought this car with money we received for *not* growing corn."

"This is taxpayers' money," Derounian said, "and it comes from the consumer through excessive crippling taxes and through high inflationary prices on essential foods he buys in the market."

And what about Farmer Smith? Ironically, the Chemung County Extension Service still is distributing information to farmers telling them how to produce more corn per acre of land. Farmer Smith says he will fertilize and take good care of the 136 acres he planted in corn, this year, and will grow just as much without the diverted acreage, so the money from the Federal Government is pure gravy. Furthermore, it is reported that Smith will plant winter wheat this fall on the land for which he was paid for not growing corn this year.

"This incident is multiplied hundreds of thousands of times, all over the country," Derounian declared. "It is the farm program I have fought against time and time again, and it is the same program President Kennedy and his Secretary of Agriculture, Orville Freeman, are advocating on an even larger scale."

"I am on the Committee on Ways and Means," the Nassau Congressman continued, "where we are now discussing the President's tax proposals, and I am incensed at the thought of increasing taxes so the money can be spent on this kind of thing. The President asks us to sacrifice. For what? Cadillacs for farmers?"

"When are the consumers going to wake up to what is being done with their money by Big Government, and when is the Federal Government—the Congress, and the Administration—going to give some consideration to the consumer?" Derounian demanded.

Spending and Taxes

As a family, or as a businessman, we do not contract new obligations when we cannot pay our existing ones. All of this seems somewhat ironical to me that Congress should be asked to consider new and costly programs and at the same time act upon legislation to raise our debt limit to the highest level in history, including wartime. It is the gradual but continuing expansion of Federal control and activity that makes necessary your high taxes and huge debts for your children and mine to pay off. After the obligation is incurred, it must be paid. The only time to control Federal cost is before the funds have been committed. That time is now.

—Congressman William H. Avery (R.-Kans.)

During the campaign of last year, Kennedy apparently convinced 51 per cent of the voters that US prestige was slipping. Since January 20, his actions have convinced the other 49 per cent.

—GOP National Chairman William E. Miller

What Do YOU Think?

Newburgh, New York, a city of 31,000, located 58 miles up the Hudson from New York City, got tired of being "the welfare city in the welfare state of the welfare nation."

The city's budget was three million dollars a year; one-third (\$983,000) was going for the relief of about 1400 persons. To quote City Manager Mitchell, "Ninety-five per cent of the population is spending one-third of its municipal revenues to support five per cent of the population."

The City Manager with the consent of the City Fathers and the enthusiastic support of most of the city's population, including ministers and teachers, worked out the 13-point program listed on the next page.

The 13 points provided that those who cannot help themselves shall be aided, but those who would like to make a career of being on relief will have to work.

As expected, the reaction of official Albany and official Washington to the announcement was explosive. Thinking the program was inspired by the financial burden, state welfare officials hurriedly came forth with a simple solution: Newburgh could shift the financial costs onto the county! It seems never to occur to welfare professionals that it is sound humanitarianism to see that able-bodied recipients get off relief, that self-reliance should be encouraged rather than deprecated.

The Federal Government through HEW (the Department of Health, Education and Welfare) has threatened to cut off payment of its share of Newburgh's relief costs unless the 13-points are tossed into the waste basket.

The position taken by the welfare bureaucracies is that local communities—the people themselves—are by nature cruel and inhuman monsters who would willingly allow men, women, and children in their midst to die of starvation. Only the intervention of the superior beings on the Federal and State payrolls can prevent "Man's inhumanity to man."

After you have read this article, make your own appraisal of the Newburgh program. Do you think it sensible or does it show a callous indifference to human suffering? Do you agree with the New Frontiersmen that we must centralize all power and control in Washington because the people themselves cannot be trusted?

The more generous explanation for the fact that relief expenditures are now several times the amounts appropriated even at the bottom of the Great Depression is that Liberals in Congress assume that only the bureaucracy will be kind and just.

But perhaps the more accurate explanation is that Liberals well know that the larger the number of people collecting government benefits, the bigger the captive vote for Liberal candidates for office.

Write your two Senators and your Representative. Support conservatives who believe this nation cannot survive if the bureaucracy saps the American people of their vitality.

Let Liberals know that it is NOT true that the great majority of the electorate is so sick of mind and soul that it will do nothing to stop the rotting away of America's strength of character.

Do your letter-writing today.

HUMAN EVENTS

-- What YOU Can Do --

Vol. XVIII, No. 28 — Section III

July 14, 1961

Newburgh Secedes From the Welfare State

IF THE STATE steps in to tell us what to do, we will fight it. If they try to take over, we will go to the courts to stop them." This is the battle cry of Joseph McD. Mitchell, City Manager of Newburgh, New York, the Hudson River town which recently became embroiled in a national uproar when it decided to tighten its public welfare laws.

"Inhuman," cried the New York State Public Welfare Association after the Newburgh city fathers decided that they'd "had it" as far as able-bodied persons on relief were concerned. The anti-Newburgh welfare policy forces have called for help from the Department of Health, Education and Welfare in Washington.

Public indignation toward many of the welfare clients had been building up for some time. Of Newburgh's 31,000 population, some 1400 are on relief. As Mitchell put it:

"Ninety-five per cent of the population is spending one-third of its municipal income to support five per cent of the population."

Two HUMAN EVENTS reporters, John Moreau and Bruce Barr, sent to the scene, found that most of the townfolk don't spare the verbiage in criticizing the welfare mess.

Public indignation led to the formation of a "committee to study welfare operations." It was composed of a physician, an accountant, and a theatre manager. The committee found "a steady influx of outsiders, principally from Southern states. These newcomers, the committee feels, while coming to the city seeking a better way of life, are the underlying cause in the steadily mounting welfare costs

"The committee finds the accessibility to slum housing and the accessibility to welfare payments to be incentives for the influx of people."

The Newburgh committee found a "possibly more than accidental movement from the South to the North" (public welfare payments per person are higher in New York than in any other state).

It found "an urgent need to have a toughening-up policy on welfare, to include a strict residency law. The effect of this will be to discourage more potential welfare cases from coming into this city."

Other important findings of this group, which are typical of the welfare programs in many Northern cities, are as follows:

"Welfare cases give the most trouble in the City Criminal Court; a majority of City Court cases are welfare cases.

"The gradual changes and widening in the philosophy of public welfare have merely changed the behavior of certain elements of the community to take advantage of it, although the behavior is primarily restricted to the new element. In short, the broadening of the base of public welfare has not curtailed social problems—it has increased them. Welfare is now a magnet for those who would migrate.

"The committee finds the degree of local autonomy and discretion in this program to be virtually nil. The purpose of local government is home rule, yet the principles of home rule are not being observed here due to the necessity to follow policies of the State and Federal governments.

"Put more simply: 'It is impossible for the City Administration to help those *it* feels need helping,

since it must help all those who are able to qualify *technically* for assistance.'

"Here again the program is not serving the interests of the local taxpayers, but is serving the dictates of the State and Federal governments. State and Federal aid mean State and Federal control.

"The Committee understands, appreciates, sympathizes with and endorses fully the broad aims of public welfare. It feels that *it is inevitable and socially necessary to devote public funds to helping needy people*. It feels, however, that the original and underlying purpose of public assistance has been lost to a large degree and that the interests of the Community as a whole are no longer being served."

What actually touched off the furor—and the question of whether a locality is fit to wend its own welfare ways or should be directed in the care of unfortunates by the State or even Federal government—were 13 "procedural changes" sent to the Newburgh Commissioner of Public Welfare by City Manager Mitchell on June 20. Mitchell had conferred with leading townspeople before releasing them.

The 13 points which are set to go into effect in mid-July read as follows:

13 Points Toward Welfare Sanity

1. All cash payments which can be converted to food, clothing, and rent vouchers and the like without basic harm to the intent of the aid shall be issued in voucher form henceforth.

2. All able-bodied adult males on relief of any kind who are capable of working are to be assigned to the Chief of Building Maintenance for work assignment on a 40-hour week.

3. All mothers of illegitimate children are to be advised that should they have any more children out of wedlock, they shall be denied relief.

4. All recipients physically capable of and available for employment who are offered a job but refuse it, regardless of the type of employment involved, are to be denied relief.

5. All applicants for relief who have left a job voluntarily, i.e., who have not been fired or laid off, shall be denied relief.

6. The allotment for any one family unit shall not exceed the take-home pay of the lowest paid city employee with a family of comparable size. Also, no relief shall be granted to any family whose income is in excess of the latter figure.

7. All files of all Aid to Dependent Children cases are to be brought to the office of the Corporation Council for review monthly. All new cases of any kind will be referred to the Corporation Council prior to certification of payment.

8. All applicants for relief who are new to the city must show evidence that their plans in coming to the city involved a concrete offer of employment, similar to that required of foreign immigrants. All such persons shall be limited to two weeks of relief. Those who cannot show evidence shall be limited to one week of relief.

9. Aid to persons except the aged, blind and disabled shall be limited to three months in any one year—this is a feature similar to the present policies of unemployment benefits.

10. All recipients who are not disabled, blind or otherwise incapacitated, shall report to the Department of Public Welfare monthly for a conference regarding the status of their case.

11. Once the budget for the fiscal year is approved by the Council, it shall not be exceeded by the Welfare Department unless approval by Council by supplemental appropriation.

12. There shall be a monthly expenditure limit on all categories of welfare aid. This monthly expenditure limit shall be established by the Department of Public Welfare at the time of presenting its budget, and shall take into account seasonal variations.

13. Prior to certifying or continuing any more Aid to Dependent Children cases, a determination shall be made as to the home environment. If the home environment is not satisfactory, the children in that home shall be placed in foster care in lieu of Welfare aid to the family adults.

UPON releasing his points, Mitchell stated that they are "designed to call a halt to the idea that the welfare program is a permanent haven for those who could and should take care of themselves." It is noted that the Mitchell manifesto does not strike out at the helpless—the blind, aged or disabled—but at able-bodied men and women whom he considers to be "riding the gravy train" at the public's expense.

The 13 points have drawn ideological battle lines every bit as sharp as those between lawmakers fighting out the New Frontier's legislative program on Capitol Hill. The question has become: Is Newburgh a cold, selfish community, a community which would allow helpless people—especially little children—to starve? And if this is the case, is it not evident that this locality is incapable of handling its own affairs, and should not State and Federal powers step in and perform the necessary humanitarian duties?

Second question: Is this not one of the few common-sense approaches any city has taken to alleviate one of our most pressing social evils—public welfare corruption?

The State welfare officials in Albany are very much of the former school of thought, and they are pressing HEW in Washington to enter the fray on their behalf. A June 26 United Press International report read: "What started as an attempt to 'reform' Newburgh's welfare procedures and cut local costs mushroomed into a matter of statewide, even national importance when state officials said they found that many points of the new program violated State and Federal welfare laws. This, they warned, could jeopardize not only the city's share of Federal-State welfare aid, but also the State's 150 million-dollar-a-year reimbursement from Washington. Clifford P. Tallcott, area director of the State Social Welfare Department, was quoted the next day as saying that the Federal government requires that before granting aid to a state, all its welfare districts must comply with the Federal program."

THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT takes the attitude that local communities—the people themselves—are incompetent to decide who should get relief and how much; that only the bureaucracy in Washington has the humane instincts and the sound judgment to make these determinations.

The reaction of the people and the press throughout the United States has been overwhelmingly on Newburgh's side. A HUMAN EVENTS reporter was given the privilege of reading an entire day's mail to Mitchell on the subject. Of 178 letters, only two were in opposition. A New York City woman wrote:

"Relief just breeds more relief. I know what I talk about because I worked for six years for a

relief dispersing agency in New York City. Relief equals inertia."

Another woman, a widow, wrote:

"I worked 20 years to raise two sons, and after 20 years of this I find that I must pay exorbitant taxes to help an able-bodied man stay home from work."

A minister wrote:

"I hope that you have fired the shot that will be heard 'round the social welfare world."

One letter was signed by 12 administrative employees of the New York City Welfare Department who wrote that they "endorse every item" in the Newburgh plan.

EDITORIALLY, the Troy, New York, *Record* said: "The most important result of the strict welfare policy inaugurated by Newburgh is that it has spotlighted the problem of soaring public welfare costs. The subject has been debated with little or no action, mainly because communities were fearful they would be denied State or Federal aid. Newburgh has become a symbol of courage The letters which have come to Newburgh's city hall from cities all over the East and from many parts of the country all laud the position taken by Mitchell. What is more, they emphasize that Newburgh's problem is not exceptional."

Wrote the New York *Daily News*, which broke the story of that city's mammoth public welfare scandal in September, 1958: "We suggest that New York City Welfare Commissioner James R. Dumpson keep a sharp eye on the Newburgh reform. He might learn something of value from it."

The *Wall Street Journal* noted that "Newburgh's tightening-up of standards is likely to mean the loss of State and Federal subsidies, which are based on looser definitions of 'need' and 'welfare.' Unfortunately, not very many localities are willing to give up government handouts, even though reducing welfare-fraud could cut off fuel for corrupt political machines and even arrest urban 'blight.' But at least Newburgh has shown one way a community can meet its obligation to those who need help without obliging those who abuse help."

The next round in this rhubarb will be an investigation of Newburgh's 13-point ruling by the New York State Welfare Board in Albany. This could lead to curtailment of State and Federal funds for the community's welfare program (welfare payments to clients come roughly 50 per cent from Federal, 25 per cent from State, and 25 per cent from local funds).

The Albany board asked City Commissioner Mitchell to appear at a hearing in the State Capital, but Mitchell replied that the problem was in New-

burgh, and that if the board members wanted an investigation they could come to Newburgh.

The New York *Herald Tribune* reported that welfare commissioners from around the state, who were holding their annual meeting in Grossinger at the time the Newburgh story broke, were "particularly disturbed by regulations that would deny relief to unwed mothers who had additional illegitimate children." Those close to the welfare picture know that many welfare commissioners are either "bleeding heart" liberals or callous professionals. They tend to perpetuate, rather than reduce, their relief rolls.

Leading members of Congress were quick to rally to the support of Newburgh. Said Senator Harry Byrd: "People who go on welfare and are able to work, should work if public work is available. If this regulation is properly administered in a fair way, I would approve it."

John Taber of suburban New York, ranking Republican on the House Appropriations Committee, said: "This sort of thing, if it became general, would do more than anything that has been done by Congress to end the so-called recession. It also would let up on the tax burden. What hurt would it do for able-bodied men to go to work?"

Congresswoman Katharine St. George, who represents the district in which Newburgh lies, praised the great courage and right-mindedness of Newburgh "in calling these abuses to the attention of the citizens, who, after all, are the ones who will pay for the abuses."

Inez Robb devoted her syndicated column of June 27 to the Newburgh story. She said in part: "... For the life of me, I can see nothing cruel or degrading in asking the man or woman, whom the public treasury is supporting, to turn to and do such jobs as the city, county or state can make available.

"Like Topsy, welfare has jes' growed, with both major political parties equally guilty of competing against each other for votes by upping the benefits. I am indeed my brother's keeper but not to the extent of feeling obligated to pay unemployment benefits to a man who last year retired voluntarily from a good job on a generous pension.

"A day after he retired he applied for unemployment insurance and received 26 weeks of benefits or enough, as he told friends, to complete the payments on his new car. It is common practice in New York for people to quit their jobs in summer and live on relief until autumn or until the spirit moves them to go back to work.

IF THE FRONTIERSMEN HAD MET



"I am convinced that Newburgh's back-to-work ukase will rid its welfare rolls of a sizable percentage of deadbeats who are allergic to work and always have been."

The argument used against Newburgh's handling of its own affairs is that "After all, there IS Federal money concerned here. We therefore MUST have an interest in this matter."

And so Big Brother—the same Big Brother who tells you he won't interfere with your schools if you accept Federal aid for education—will soon slap down the people of Newburgh, New York, because they have the audacity to think that they can determine their own public welfare policies in a manner which they consider best for their own community.

Wake up, you Newburgh reactionaries. What do you think this is—a free country?

ORDER BLANK

HUMAN EVENTS, 410 First Street, S. E. Washington 3, D. C.

Send me _____ reprints of "NEWBURGH SECEDES FROM THE WELFARE STATE" at \$ _____

☐ Payment enclosed ☐ Bill me

Additional copies of this 4-page article: single copy 20c (coins, not stamps); 10 copies \$1; 25 copies \$2; 100 copies \$5; 500 copies \$20; 1,000 copies \$30. In 5,000 lots \$25 per thousand. Unless otherwise ordered, reprints are sent by fourth-class mail, which takes ten days to two weeks for delivery. For first-class mail delivery of 4-page articles add 1c per copy; for airmail add 2c per copy

Enter my subscription ☐ 5 weeks for \$1 ☐ 1 year for \$12.50

Name _____

Street _____

City _____ Zone _____ State _____

IF YOU LIKE THIS ARTICLE You should subscribe to HUMAN EVENTS, the weekly Washington Newsletter, reporting to 50,000 business and political leaders on politics, labor, taxes and business. HUMAN EVENTS will tell you each week the news behind the news from the Nation's Capital. TRIAL SUBSCRIPTION: \$1 for 5 weeks. One year: \$12.50. YOUR MONEY BACK IF DISSATISFIED.

How Not to Save Berlin

By Westbrook Pegler

BRIG. Gen. Frank L. Howley, cavalry soldier and scholar, the author of the following article, is qualified by personal experience in combat and in political conflict with the Russians in Berlin to discuss the American and British errors and failures which created the continuing Berlin crisis. Soldiers of his own small command slugged Russian soldiers who tried to stop them on their way into Berlin and left them unconscious at the roadside. General Howley would have used the same direct means on the whole Russian power if the United States had given him the authority.

He has often said that the Russians were a sloppy, incompetent, lawless mob at the time, bent on rape and loot, but easily beaten by a determined opponent. He has many battle awards and other distinctions and is now a vice-president of New York University.



Frank L. Howley

Since General Howley is a personal and professional friend of long standing, I asked him for his opinion. Here it is:

June 28, 1961

Dear Westbrook:

You've asked me what I think about the Berlin situation. Unless we look at the past and see the boners that we've made, we can't understand either where we are or where we are likely to go.

Berlin has been a fiasco and it has not been the fault of us poor working stiffs who were in the military government of Berlin up through the blockade.

In the first place, *we* could have taken Berlin! I went around the Battle of the Bulge to the headquarters of The Ninth Army, at Guetersloh. I was kept waiting an hour for the G-5, whose name was Colonel Craigy. When he came out of conference he said, "Howley, where in hell are you and your military government detachments?"

I replied, "We're back in Namur, Belgium, waiting for orders to come forward."

He said, "I've been trying to get your unit released to us by SHAEF because I have no military government personnel to take care of Berlin and we can be there within two days, at the latest, once we're given clearance to go. However, just now we received orders that we are to hold our position along the Elbe and not move to take Berlin." He continued, "There is nothing between us and Berlin except one regiment of SS at Potsdam. We can run over them without getting out of our tanks. We have three bridgeheads across the Elbe. Two are good. One has been pretty much knocked out, but we only need one." Then he added a wisecrack because I was a colonel in the cavalry assigned to head the military government group for Berlin. He said, "Of course, the regiment at Potsdam chased your cavalry out this afternoon." My "cavalry" consisted of three fellows in a jeep doing reconnaissance.

I left at his headquarters a British lieutenant-colonel and an American lieutenant-colonel and two motorcyclists. That night I drove back to Namur, Belgium, to my detachment having assured Craigy that, if he got hold of me by telephone or by motorcycle, I would have the British and American military government units moving toward Berlin within two hours. We would definitely catch up to him before Berlin and we would be ready to take over military government. Of course, the order never came through.

The American Army was held at the Elbe and Berlin was permitted to be taken by the Soviets, who had a tough fight because the Germans had pulled their best units from in front of the American Army and thrown them around to hold off the Russians on the other side.

Finally, late in April, 1945, my unit was tacked on to the First Airborne and moved up as close as we could get to the Elbe. We established headquarters at Detmold. There, we waited for permission to go to Berlin. Permission finally came. I was designated as commander of the detachment, called the Preliminary Reconnaissance Party for Berlin, and given orders to move to Berlin and do a ground estimate of the situation to support our aerial studies before our main units moved into Berlin.

As I have written in my book, *Berlin Command*, when we got to the Elbe we were kept there seven and a half hours by the Soviets. They had a stick across the road, a guard standing by it who told us that we couldn't go through. We had the same decision to make then that we have been confronted with since then: Do you go through and risk shooting someone or getting shot, or do you do what the Soviets demand?

My orders were that I do what the Soviets demanded. So, at the end of seven and a half hours, I proceeded to Berlin with a small fraction of the force I had been given to reconnoiter Berlin, and was directed and led by the Soviets *not* to Berlin but to Potsdam to do a housekeeping job for which we were not equipped. The housekeeping job was to get Potsdam ready for the Big Three Conference, which was to be a Roosevelt, Churchill and Stalin affair, but turned out to be Truman, Attlee and Stalin.

FROM that day until this we have been pushed around in Berlin and have taken the pushing about. We are always confronted with the threat of force, a world war, etc. And, almost without fail, we back down and give the Soviets what they want. There are no new lessons anywhere in the world to be learned about the Soviets which we should not have learned in Berlin, but we just do not learn. Each new team comes in with its new hopes and goes over exactly the same ground of persuasion by smiling, of friendship, of making concessions and then getting verbally slapped in the face.

To get back to Berlin in the past. By the time I arrived on the first of July 1945, I had decided that we would never go to Berlin at the price of giving to the Soviets the rich lands of Saxony, Thuringia, and other areas which had been captured and at that time were occupied by our armies. Patton's army had gone all

the way to the border of Czechoslovakia. Yet, when we moved in to Berlin on the first of July, we had agreed to give the Russians those rich lands with cattle in the field, warehouses packed with everything including clothing at Halle, in return for our section of what was a destroyed city of suffering. Because we had not been allowed to do a ground reconnaissance, the first units moving into Berlin had to sleep in the woods. We used our steel helmets as wash basins and carried our tents on our backs. In the Grunvald we put our vehicles in a circle so that the rioting, drunken Russians, who were shooting all over the woods at us, could stay away from us or else. They stayed away! After sitting there for days with no permission to go anywhere in the city, I ordered my men to occupy the U.S. sector with or without Russian consent. Confronted with an accomplished fact, the Soviets shrugged and let us stay.

When we got our U.S. sector, it had been completely stripped of everything of value. Seventy-five hundred cows from nearby farms within the city limits had been taken away. Later they traded us the milk for flour. The butcher shops and canneries were stripped of equipment. The railroad was stripped of signal equipment.

About the 7th of July, when the representatives of the United States and Britain flew into Berlin and met, I had three lawyers draw up a demand upon the Soviets at the first meeting. The demand included payment for the material and things taken out of the U.S. sector, at a time when we had left everything in the areas of East Germany captured by us. Because of my practical attitude, I got a tongue lashing at that first meeting and was put in my place with the words, "Such views are not in accordance with the will of Washington."

The American delegation arrived at the headquarters of Marshal Zhukov with no agenda and no plan—it was to be a social meeting. The first thing Zhukov did after shaking hands was to sit down and immediately say something like, "Now, gentlemen, let's get to work. When are you going to bring in your share of coal for the city? The British and American delegations had already turned over the agricultural lands to the Soviets and had assumed that the Soviets would feed the city. The American delegate laughed and said he didn't have any coal. Coal was for the British to figure out. They had the Ruhr. The matter was referred to our governments and we acquiesced again. Having bought our way into Berlin, we then bought our right to stay there by supplying our share of the food for the city of Berlin and our share of coal along with other things, including medical drugs. The Russians demanded that the stooge government, which they had appointed before we got into Berlin, take bathtubs, furniture and other items from homes to pay them for the food they had given to the Berliners before we arrived. This demand was to include steel from the ruined buildings, as there was a lot of steel all over the city as a result of our bombardments. On this particular request, I unequivocally forbid the appointed city government to take anything more out of the U.S. sector. The British and French followed suit.

THESE experiences in Berlin are being repeated now in different form. The Soviets want control of all Germany. They have taken what they could grab—East Germany and East Berlin. Now they want all of Berlin and their next step is all of Germany. They are willing to take the control on any basis that is completely favorable to them. Originally, they wanted a single currency for Germany with their right to print, without supervision, their share of the currency down at Leipzig in the eastern zone. If we had agreed, they would have run the printing presses night and day

and bought Ruhr steel for pieces of paper. We wouldn't even have known how much currency they issued. They would be willing to take control on the basis of a coalition government wherein East Germany would be recognized on a par with West Germany. They would get sufficient control in the common governments so that they could pull a Czechoslovakian steal—known as a *Putsch*.

Khrushchev's threat to turn over government control to the East German government is a joke. He has already announced seven times that they've turned over control. The East German government is a plain stooge government hated by the German people from both East and West. If the Soviet Army pulled out, within eight months the German people would hang the Communist Ulbricht.

We would then be confronted with a problem: Would we go back into those areas we've liberated and turned over to the Soviets to maintain order, or would we stand by while Soviet tanks came back in as they did in Hungary and ran over the people of East Germany?

The Berlin question cannot be settled in Berlin because it's a world-wide problem. There's nothing new in Berlin. We should be making the demands and issuing the ultimatums to the Soviets to live up to past agreements, to permit elections all over Germany, and to return to common control the part of Berlin which they've stolen away and which we could have demanded back at the time we went to Paris after the blockade.

That's another pathetic story: After winning the victory in the blockade at a cost of a billion dollars and seventy-two lives, we meekly went to Paris and agreed to a *status quo* in Berlin, which meant that the Soviets got away with their crime and got complete control of a third of the city. Needless to say, of course, they didn't return Saxony, Thuringia or any of the lands that we had turned over to them as part of the agreement for our going to Berlin.

The present situation in Berlin is wrapped up with the whole international situation and all of our dealings with the Soviet Union. I'm hopeful that the new President, now that he has seen the face of the enemy in Vienna, will start issuing ultimatums and demand that our rights be respected instead of continuing simply to defend what few rights remain to us in the Germany which we fought so hard to liberate from the former tyranny of the Nazis.

Sincerely

Frank L. Howley

ORDER BLANK			
HUMAN EVENTS, 410 First Street, S. E. Washington 3, D. C.			
Send me reprints of "HOW NOT TO SAVE BERLIN"			
at \$			
☐ Payment enclosed		☐ Bill me	
Additional copies of this 2-page article: single copy 15c (coins, not stamps); 15 copies \$1; 35 copies \$2; 125 copies \$5; 300 copies \$10; 1,000 copies \$20. In 5,000 lots \$15 per thousand. Unless otherwise ordered, reprints are sent by fourth-class mail, which takes ten days to two weeks for delivery. For first class delivery of 2-page articles, add ½c per copy; for airmail, add 2c per copy.			
Enter my subscription ☐ 5 weeks for \$1 ☐ 1 year for \$12.50			
Name			
Street			
City Zone State			

LAST CALL!



Only A Few More Reservation Checks Can Be Accepted Get Yours In By *AIRMAIL* Today!

The Second HUMAN EVENTS Political Action Conference will be held at the Mayflower Hotel in Washington, D. C., on July 14 and 15.

Leading Senators, Representatives, and noted Washington correspondents will be Conference speakers. In the seminar discussions, they will tell you what you can do back home to promote sound legislation and defeat unsound legislation.

The pressures of inflationary spending programs have been growing. The demagogues and the con men have been promising a Santa Claus government. The egghead Americans for Democratic Action and COPE, the political arm of the AFL-CIO, are working for the creation of a centralized all-powerful Federal Government, the blueprint for socialism.

HUMAN EVENTS aims to rally together in Washington those who believe in limited constitutional government, states' rights, private enterprise and individual freedom.

This Conference comes as the Convention Season

is beginning in Washington. First come, first served. MAIL YOUR RESERVATION IMMEDIATELY.

The Conference fee, which includes luncheon and dinner on both Friday and Saturday, is \$75 per person and \$40 for additional members of the same immediate family—wives, sons, daughters. The \$40 rate will also apply to students, teachers, clergymen and members of the Young Americans for Freedom (YAF) and the Intercollegiate Society of Individualists (ISI). Fees will be refunded to persons unable to attend for any reason whatsoever.

Hotel accommodations are extra. Special room rates at the Mayflower Hotel have been arranged. Singles are priced at \$10; doubles at \$15. Every room is air conditioned.

If you have already made reservations, and now find that you will be unable to attend the Conference, please let us know soon. Space is at a premium, and must not go unused.

HUMAN EVENTS 410 First Street, S. E., Washington 3, D. C.		Friday Menu Preference
Name		☐ Meat ☐ Fish
Address City..... Zone..... State.....		
Name		☐ Meat ☐ Fish
Address City..... Zone..... State.....		
Name		☐ Meat ☐ Fish
Address City..... Zone..... State.....		
Name		☐ Meat ☐ Fish
Address City..... Zone..... State.....		
Enclosed is my check or money order in the amount of \$..... to cover the Conference fee at \$75 per person, and \$40 for additional members of the same family.		
In the listing of tentative subjects below, I have placed numbers (1 thru 7) to indicate the order of my preference.		
☐ Communism	☐ Federal School Aid	☐ Area Redevelopment
☐ Labor Problems	☐ Foreign Aid	☐ 1962 Campaign
	☐ Medicare	

Conference Speakers:

Sen. Barry M. Goldwater
Sen. Roman L. Hruska
Sen. Jack Miller
Sen. Andrew Schoeppel
Sen. John G. Tower
Rep. Katharine St. George
Rep. James F. Battin
Rep. E. Y. Berry
Rep. Harold R. Collier
Rep. William C. Cramer
Rep. Paul Findley
Rep. Howard W. Robison
Rep. Henry C. Schadeberg
Rep. Gordon H. Scherer
Rep. Don L. Short
Rep. Charles M. Teague
Holmes Alexander
Fulton Lewis, III
Adm. Ben Moreell
Peter O'Donnell

About Rep. Cooley

Tom Anderson, Editor of *Farm and Ranch*, is first and foremost outspoken. He says what he thinks and he says it in pungent language.

After one of his visits to Washington, he wrote one of his famous "Straight Talk" editorials in which he described Democratic Congressman Harold Cooley in the following language:



ANDERSON

"Next statesman I rallied 'round the flag with was Congressman Harold Cooley of North Carolina, Chairman of the House Agriculture Committee, a 12-cent politician. (He was a two-bit politician when we had a 100-cent dollar.) Chairman Cooley's heart bleeds so profusely for North Carolina farmers that he has to get periodic transfusions from the union labor leaders he plays footsie with. (Swap-out support for \$1.25 minimum wage in return for 90% parity.) Cooley pontificated, 'The Brannan Plan was just too complicated, tried to cover too many commodities . . . Anybody who believes agriculture can ever be free from controls and subsidies is stupid. If we had the kind of farm program you favor, I'd sell my farm tomorrow.'

"'Why don't you?' I answered. 'Why should the taxpayers have to pay you twice?'

"'But what about those poor people Congressman Cooley gives employment to on his farm?' butted-in one of the Congressman's secretaries.

"'If land prices,' I replied, 'hadn't been forced up by absentee, tax-reduction, inflation-hedging, soil-banking business and professional men, maybe those poor people the Congressman hires could afford to own their own farms.' Thus the interview with the advocate of uncomplicated socialistic programs ended."

The Cane Curtain

The Cane Curtain that has fallen around Cuba is as disastrous to freedom as the Iron Curtain in Europe or the Bamboo Curtain in Red China.

The rest of the world watches to see whether the Western Hemisphere can expel the Communist beachhead in Cuba or whether, as Nikita Khrushchev has proclaimed, the Monroe Doctrine is dead.

Any evidence that the United States is resigned to the existence of a Red satellite less than a hundred miles from our shoreline will almost certainly bring more of the same in other Latin American countries.

—Congressman Joe M. Kilgore (D.-Tex.)

Freedom Riders

Senator Russell (D.-Ga.), meeting his friend, Senator Eastland (D.-Miss.), said: "I understand, Jim, down in your state they have some freedom riders in jail." Receiving an affirmative answer, Senator Russell said: "Hang on to them. You might get some tractors."

Advice to Rockefeller

From the New York Daily News

Governor Nelson Rockefeller says he sees little hope of a 1962 state income tax rebate, because state government costs continue to rise and "if the money is not there, how are you going to make a tax rebate?"

One answer to that is that you can put the money there by cutting spending rather than constantly increasing it. You can easily economize when you are a Governor with both houses of the Legislature in your hip pocket.

We suspect, though, that the real answer is that the Governor next year, with his hopes for the 1964 Presidential nomination depending on his reelection, will find that after all, surprise, surprise, and see how good he is to us, there *can* be a rebate.

My country fell because we had come to consider France as a cow to be milked and not a watchdog to be fed.

—An old French peasant (after France fell, 1940)

Congressman Findley's Taped Interview—\$8

Paul Findley, freshman Republican from Illinois' 20th Congressional District, is the guest on this week's CONGRESSIONAL INTERVIEW. Mr. Findley explains his opposition to the Administration proposal for a permanent disarmament agency and points out the impending dangers of the proposed farm program.



FINDLEY

This 12½-minute tape-recorded interview is the eighteenth in the 1961 series of HUMAN EVENTS CONGRESSIONAL INTERVIEW.

The price for single interviews is \$8. If you enter an order for one interview a month the price is \$6, one a week \$5. \$1 is refunded for each tape returned.

Other interviews which you may wish to have are listed below. They are the first seventeen weekly interviews in the 1961 series:

1. John H. Rousselot (R.-Calif.)
2. John M. Ashbrook (R.-Ohio)
3. William Jennings Bryan Dorn (D.-S.C.)
4. Peter A. Garland (R.-Maine)
5. Bruce Alger (R.-Texas)
6. Donald C. Bruce (R.-Ind.)
7. Harold R. Collier (R.-Ill.)
8. Richard H. Poff (R.-Va.)
9. Edward J. Derwinski (R.-Ill.)
10. Henry C. Schadeberg (R.-Wisc.)
11. John J. Rhodes (R.-Ariz.)
12. Edgar W. Hiestand (R.-Calif.)
13. Thomas M. Pelly (R.-Wash.)
14. John Bell Williams (D.-Miss.)
15. James F. Battin (R.-Mont.)
16. Peter H. Dominick (R.-Colo.)
17. Frank J. Becker (R.-N.Y.)

The 12½-minute length of these interviews makes them ideal for a 15-minute radio program. Many serve as the weekly highlight of organization meetings.

Help your organization and your community to **BE INFORMED ON TIME**. Write now for HUMAN EVENTS CONGRESSIONAL INTERVIEW.